REMARKS

This paper is filed to conform this case to practice after July 30, 2003. As noted above, the original *Amendment* was filed prior to the change in practice; however due to a docketing error the response of July 17, 2003 has yet to be considered. In any event, a typographical error has been corrected in previously presented Claim 18.

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0935 for additional claims if additional fees are required.

It was noted by Counsel at the interview in July 2003 that any doubt as to patentability in this application is resolved by the remarkable durability of the claimed apparatus. In this regard, the *Declaration of Dana Markwell* provides on page 4:

Utilizing cast-in heaters in place of the previously used ring heaters has produced unexpected results. Indeed, with the use of cast-in heaters, we have been able to virtually eliminate heater failures. Between March 1, 2001 and February 28, 2002, the ten pressing machines described above have experienced only 7 cast-in heater failures requiring replacement of the cast-in heater. This represents a substantial decrease from the number of ring heater failures mentioned above -- 7 cast-in heater failures over a one-year period for ten pressing machines operating a total of 100 cast-in heaters versus 345 ring heater failures over a one-year period for four pressing machines operating a total of 60 ring heaters.

Declaration of Dana Markwell, May, 2002. The decrease in heater failures, 7/100 versus 345/60 is quire remarkable. In view of the Declaration, all claims are believed clearly allowable. See MPEP, Section 716(a) and following; note also, In re Chupp, 2 USPQ2d 1437 (CAFC 1987).

In view of this and prior responses, allowance is believed warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael W. Ferrell Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 31,158

Ferrells, PLLC P.O. Box 312 Clifton, Virginia 20124-1706 Telephone: 703-266-3000 Facsimile: 703-266-6000 December 19, 2003